



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/670,877	09/27/2000	KAZUO ICHIKAWA	107469	7376

25944 7590 04/22/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, RUDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1763	13

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/670,877	ICHIKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner Rudy Zervigon	Art Unit 1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 6, 2002 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6, drawn to a CVD system, classified in class 118, subclass 723R.

II. Claims 3 and 4, drawn to a substrate cleaning method, classified in class 427, subclass 553.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, for example, etching.

Art Unit: 1763

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. During a telephone conversation with Joel Armstrong on April 17, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1, 2, 5, and 6. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 3 and 4 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 claim both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus according to “to produce plasma in the plasma generator and generate radicals...” and “radicals in the plasma are introduced into the film deposition chamber”, as such claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on the theory that the claims are directed to neither a “process” nor a “machine,” but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. *Id.* at 1551. (MPEP 2173.05(p)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 claim both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus according to “to produce plasma in the plasma generator and generate radicals...” and “radicals in the plasma are introduced into the film deposition

chamber", as such claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph (In Ex parte Lyell, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990), MPEP 2173.05(p)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara et al (U. S. Pat. 5,648,276) in view of Babayan et al (US 2002/0129902 A1). Hara et al teaches a CVD system (C₁, C₂; Figure 2; column 7, lines 7-8) provided with a plasma generator (Fig.3, "UE", column 7, lines 15-20) having a plasma generation chamber (Fig. 3 containing "PL"; column 7, lines 15-20) separated from a film deposition chamber (Fig. 3 "QW" and "SW"; column 7, lines 10-15) in which a substrate (1) is arranged. A material gas (Fig.3, "Gas (SiH₄, etc)") is directly supplied into the film deposition chamber, radicals in the plasma are introduced into the film deposition chamber from the plasma generator through introduction holes ("ME", mesh, Fig.3) of a lower plate (lower half of "ME"), and a thin film ("a-Si:H", column 7, lines 5-10) is deposited on the substrate. A gas feeder ("Gas (Ar, ...); Fig.3) is provided to the plasma generator.

Hara et al further teaches a silicon-based film is deposited on a substrate ("a-Si:H", column 7, lines 5-10, lines 65-67), then converting the silicon-based film to a crystalline silicon-based film by laser annealing (column 8, lines 5-11), then depositing a gate insulating film ("SiO₂"; column

8, lines 20-25) on the crystalline film by a CVD system comprised of a separate film deposition chamber and plasma generation chamber as described above. Plasma “cleaning” is discussed as a step prior to forming the gate insulating film (column 13, lines 9-20). Also, see column 14, lines 10-25 and column 17, lines 1-10.

Hara does not teach that the lower plate (lower half of “ME”) is connected to ground thereby allowing only radicals to pass. Further, Hara does not teach diameters of his introduction holes thereby allowing only radicals to pass.

Babayan teaches a capacitively coupled plasma apparatus (Figure 1). Specifically, Babayan teaches both upper (26, 28) and lower (22) electrodes as grounded ([0042]) thereby allowing only radicals to pass ([0039]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to ground Hara’s upper electrode (ME) as taught by Babayan, and to optimize the dimension of Hara’s introduction hole diameters thereby allowing only radicals to pass.

Motivation for Hara to ground is upper electrode as taught by Babayan and for Hara to optimize the dimension of Hara’s introduction hole diameters thereby allowing only radicals to pass is to avoid ion induced damage (last line, [0039]). Further, it is well established that changes in apparatus dimensions are within the level of ordinary skill in the art.(Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc. , 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied , 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); In re Rose , 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); See MPEP 2144.04).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed December 6, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (703) 305-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official after final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9311. The official before final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9310. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (703) 308-0661. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills, at (703) 308-1633.

Benjamin L. Utech
BENJAMIN L. UTECH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700